



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/033,644	12/27/2001	Katrina Mikhaylichenko	LAM2P316	7982
25920	7590	11/18/2003	EXAMINER	
MARTINE & PENILLA, LLP 710 LAKEWAY DRIVE SUITE 170 SUNNYVALE, CA 94085			NGUYEN, KHIEM D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2823	

DATE MAILED: 11/18/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action	Application No. 10/033,644	Applicant(s) MIKHAYLICHENKO ET AL.	
	Examiner Khiem D Nguyen	Art Unit 2823	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 20 October 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
(a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
(c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: none.

Claim(s) objected to: none.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-24

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

8. ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).
10. ☐ Other: _____


W. DAVID COLEMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In response to applicant's argument that Yoon (U.S. Pub. 2002/0090784) teaches a method for manufacturing a semiconductor device with no reference to a low K dielectric layer, examiner respectfully disagree, applicants is directed to Vyvoda et al. (U.S. Pub. 2002/0105057), page 2, paragraph [0020], a low K dielectric layer is disclosed. In the Office Action mailed 08/06/2003, Vyvoda et al. is being used as a secondary reference to disclose removing the residues (page 2, paragraph [0019]) from the low K dielectric layer (page 2, paragraph [0020]), the removing being enhanced by scrubbing the low K dielectric layer of the semiconductor wafer with a wet brush (page 2, paragraph [0021]) that applies a fluid mixture including a cleaning chemistry (standard clean SC1) solution including a combination of NH_2OH , H_2O_2 , and deionized (DI) water (page 1, paragraph [0004]) and Yoon is only being used to disclose wherein the combination ratio of NH_2OH , H_2O_2 , and deionized (DI) water is about 1:4:20. Therefore, applicant's arguments are moot.

Applicants further stated that "Because Vyvoda et al. does not teach one of ordinary skill in the art regarding hydrophobic low K dielectric layers, the combination of Vyvoda et al. and Yoon cannot provide the motivation to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine a cleaning chemistry and a wetting agent to clean a hydrophobic low K dielectric layer". However, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., hydrophobic low K dielectric) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).